REMARKS

I.   35 USC § 102(b) rejections of claims 1, 2, 9-11, 18-20, and 26 by US Pat. No. 6,502,000 by Arnold, et al. ("Arnold"). Applicant traverses these rejections.

For a claim to be anticipated, Arnold must describe each element and limitation of that claim.[1] Further, Arnold "must also enable one of skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention."[2] In addition to incorporating Applicant's previous responses of record, below, Applicant shows that none of Applicant's claims are anticipated by Arnold or Hirota.

To more particularly describe Applicant's invention and to expressly rely on claim language in accordance with Examiner's "Response to Arguments" notations on page 8 of the Final Office Action dated August 21, 2007, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19, and respectfully requests entry of these amended claims.

Turning to the anticipatory rejection, Applicant respectfully asserts that Arnold does not describe Applicant's amended claim 1' mapping element and its many limitations, namely "mapping, after the receiving, of the commands and the options to inputs on the common interface, thereby producing mapped inputs, wherein the mapped inputs result from converting, at the server device, the user interface descriptions translated into the common format in XML to the inputs on the common interface of the client device without changing code at the client device and the server device." For one, Arnold does result in changing of code unlike Applicant's claimed invention. *See, e.g.,* Arnold, c. 9, ll. 56-63. For another, Arnold does not describe user interface descriptions in a common format in XML.

In addition and in the alternative, Applicant respectfully asserts that Arnold does not describe Applicant's amended claim 1' receiving element and its many limitations, namely

---

[1] *C.R. Bard, Inc. v. M3 Systems, Inc.,* 157 F.3d 1340, 1349 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *Celeritas Techs. Ltd. v. Rockwell Intl. Corp.,* 150 F.3d 1354, 1360 (Fed. Cir. 1998).
[2] *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Laboratories, Inc.,* 246 F.3d 1368, 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2001)(quoting *In re Donohue,* 766 F.2d 531, 533 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

"receiving, by the client device, of user interface descriptions from the server device, wherein the user interface descriptions comprise commands and options of the server device translated, at the server device, into a common format in XML."

As a result of the foregoing, Applicant's amended independent claim 1, and the similarly amended independent claims 10 and 19, are not anticipated by Arnold because it both fails to describe Applicant's mapping and receiving elements and all of their respective limitations, and, in addition and in the alternative, does not enable one of skill in the art to make and use the Applicant's invention."[3] Further, since all independent claims herein are not anticipated by Arnold, then neither are any dependent claims therefrom.[4] Accordingly, withdraw of all rejections under § 102(b) by Arnold is respectfully requested.

II.   35 USC § 102(e) rejections of claims 1-12, 14-16, and 18-27 by US Pub. App. No. 2003/015889 A1 by Hirota ("Hirota"). Applicant traverses these rejections.

Using the same law of anticipation as stated in Section I, Hirota also fails to anticipate amended independent claims 1, 10 and 19. Unlike Hirota, Applicant's mapping element does not include Hirota's "bind layer" at all or anything similar to it; in fact, Hirota's biding layer teaches away from Applicant's invention and would not work in Applicant's invention. Specifically, Hirota describes taking commands at the server level and then performing binding in a layer located in the client device. Applicant's mapping, however, involves two translations occurring – one at the server-side and one at the client-side – rather than just the one occurring in Hirota at the client-side. In Applicant's amended claim 1, the foregoing is stated as: (1) the client receives "user interface descriptions from the server device…translated into a common format in XML" and then (2) "mapping, after the receiving, of the commands and the options to inputs on the common interface, thereby producing mapped inputs at the client device, wherein the mapped inputs result from converting, at the server device, the user interface descriptions translated into the common

---

[3] *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Laboratories, Inc.*, 246 F.3d 1368, 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2001)(quoting *In re Donohue*, 766 F.2d 531, 533 (Fed. Cir. 1985).
[4] *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1076 (Fed. Cir. 1988)(if independent claim is allowable, then so are the dependent claims).

format in XML to the inputs on the common interface of the client device without changing code at the client device and the server device."

The client-sided mapping with a bind layer as in Hirota prevents the scalability ingenuity of Applicant's invention. In Hirota, the binding layer essentially blows up. By example, if there are 10 machines with 10 commands each, then Hirota's binding application would have to have 100 different commands understood. That is, Hirota is not scalable. By contrast, Applicant's invention says to the client device that these are the commands in XML from the server device and this is how they are mapped on the server side, *i.e.*, "user interface descriptions from the server device…translated into a common format in XML." Then, Applicant's client-devices reads the translated information it receives from the server-device and maps them to inputs on the common interface, *i.e.*, Applicant's mapping element and its limitations. As a result, Applicant's invention is scalable unlike Hirota because Hirota, unlike Applicant, must have a translation for every device on the client-side.

Having claimed and shown that Applicant's mapping and receiving elements and their respective limitations are markedly different from Hirota's, that Hirota's description actually teaches away from Applicant's invention to therefore non-enable Applicant's invention, and Applicant's invention has the advantage of scalability that Hirota does not, Applicant respectfully asserts that Hirota fails to anticipate Applicant's amended independent claim 1, and by analogy amended independent claims 10 and 19 as a matter of law."[5] In addition, since all independent claims herein are not anticipated by Hirota, then neither are any dependent claims therefrom.[6] Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdraw of all rejections under § 102(b) by Hirota.

---

[5] *Bristol-Myers Squibb Co. v. Ben Venue Laboratories, Inc.*, 246 F.3d 1368, 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2001)(quoting *In re Donohue*, 766 F.2d 531, 533 (Fed. Cir. 1985).
[6] *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1076 (Fed. Cir. 1988)(if independent claim is allowable, then so are the dependent claims).

III. 35 USC § 103(a) rejections of claim 17 by US Pub. App. No. 2003/015889 A1 by Hirota ("Hirota") and claim 13 over Hirota in view of US Pat. No. 6,763,399 B2 by Margalit, et al. ("Margalit").

As shown in the foregoing remarks under Sections I and II, supra, since Applicant's amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by either Arnold or Hirota, and since the same foregoing remarks equally apply by analogy to Applicant's other amended independent claims 10 and 19, then any and all claims depending therefrom are also not rendered obvious.[7] Accordingly, and as a matter of law, Applicant respectfully requests that all § 103(a) rejections based on Hirota and Margalit be withdrawn as to claims 13 and 17.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Applicant invites the Office to freely reach Applicant's attorney using the contact information found in his signature block below.

No fee is believed due with this paper. However, if any fee is determined to be required, the Office is authorized to charge Deposit Account 50-0563 for any such required fee.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 21, 2007

/Erik J. Osterrieder/
Erik J. Osterrieder
Reg. No. 48,966
Schubert Osterrieder & Nickelson PLLC
6013 Cannon Mtn. Dr., S14
Austin, TX 78749
Tel: (713) 533-0494
Fax: (512) 301-7301
E-mail: ejo@sonlaw.com
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT/ASSIGNEE

---

[7] *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1076 (Fed. Cir. 1988)(if independent claim is allowable, then so are the dependent claims).